

ARIZONA HISTORICAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

March 28, 2006

MINUTES

The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission (AHAC) met at 1:00 pm. on March 28, 2006 at the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, in the Director's Office Conference Room, at 1700 W. Washington, Suite 200, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

ATTENDANCE

Members

Shelley Cohn
Retired, Representing the Arts Community
John Driggs, Chairman
Phoenix Heritage Commission
Jim Garrison, State Historic Preservation Officer
State Historic Preservation Office, Arizona State Parks
Noel J. Stowe, Chair/Professor of History
Arizona State University
GladysAnn Wells, Director
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records
Beth Vershure, Station Manager, KAET-TV Channel 8
Arizona State University
Julie Yoder, Executive Director
Arizona Humanities Council

Attended via Teleconference:

Betsy Stunz-Hall, Representative
Arizona Library Association
Catherine May, Senior Historical Analyst/Archivist
Salt River Project

ABSENT

Members:

Richard Sims, Director
Sharlot Hall Museum
Anne Woosley, Executive Director
Arizona Historical Society
Hartman Lomawaima, Director
Arizona State Museum
Ken Travous, Director
Arizona State Parks
Melodee Jackson, Director, Constituent Service
Office of the Governor

Guests: Victor Pawlak,
Westward Ho Hotel
David Tatum,
Arizona Historical Society

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Garrison called the meeting to order at 1:26 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 28, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Garrison motioned, and Stunz-Hall seconded, that the minutes of the February 28, 2006 meeting be approved. The motion passed.

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

GladysAnn introduced the visitor, Victor Pawlek, from the Westward Ho Hotel. He wanted to come and explain the Westward Ho's interest in the Centennial. She also announced that the Chairman, Richard Sims could not be present today and Betsy Stunz-Hall and Catherine May would be joining us via teleconference and we have a quorum.

GladysAnn asked for a volunteer to Chair today's meeting – Jim Garrison volunteered.

Discussion/Action

Reconfirm Legacy Criteria w/Dec 20th minutes

GladysAnn suggested we reverse the agenda items and get the business discussions done first while everyone is still present.

Jim stated last month we approved the Legacy Project Criteria.

Shelley corrected him and said we tentatively approved the Legacy Project Criteria.

Jim stated he recalls we had approved the criteria. He asked Shelley to read them off.

Shelley read the criteria:

To be considered the projects must:

1. Accurately portray a significant aspect of Arizona history
2. Be assessable to a large number of visitors/users
3. Include partnering – planning and demonstrating a cooperative effort between public and private sectors
4. Be an enduring product that will live on after 2012
5. Include an educational component

6. Include an implementation strategy

Shelley said the criteria go in tandem with the mission statement. The AZ Historical Advisory Commission encourages centennial commemorations that celebrate AZ unique history heritage, culture and arts. We hope to leave a create a promising future by leaving lasting legacy because when the criteria are by themselves it does not include culture and the arts but if you include the mission statement it gives people from those areas the feeling they are included.

Jim asked “so we would have to reconfirm the mission statement tied to the legacy criteria since they kind of go together?”

Shelley said she thought that when we publish them or share them that they should go as a packet rather than separately.

Jim: Can we have a motion before we go to the discussion?

Shelley Motioned and John 2nd the motion.

Jim asked for a discussion regarding the mission statement or criteria.

Julie stated that what Shelley said made a lot of sense and that’s why we put them all together on the form – they need each other.

Jim said in December we all thought it was well done and there was not a lot of discussion then.

Beth had a question as to whether this boils down to be our mission statement. She thought we had a longer one, she wrote it down on the fact sheet and she took it right out of the minutes.

Jim asked Beth if she had the vision statement in front of her.

Beth said she copied down that our mission was to “Develop, encourage, and coordinate a statewide plan for Arizona’s centennial in 2012 including advising the legislature and state agencies on centennial history and heritage”, etc....and the vision was “A commemoration that encourages all Arizonans to reflect on our unique and authentic history, to experience the rich and diverse tapestry of our heritage, to explore our promising future and that ensures a lasting legacy for future generations.”

Shelley said that’s why she wanted to bring this up again to make sure we coordinate all the various drafts into one that we can all agree on.

Noel said that we spent some time on this vision and he thinks the vision should be incorporated into this as well.

Jim asked Shelley to amend her motion to be that mission statement and the vision statement with the Legacy Criteria

Shelley agreed.

GladysAnn said we all want the Legacy Criteria to be in context with our Vision and Mission Statement because no one wants those Legacy Criteria in isolation.

Jim asked Shelley to amend her motion to just the Legacy Criteria

Shelley said that it is in support of the Mission and Vision.

Jim asked John if he was comfortable with that.

John – Yes

Jim said we are just voting on the Legacy Criteria as stated by Shelley and asked if there was any further discussion on the Legacy Criteria?

Betsy stated the Legacy Project Criteria were approved on the 31st of January on page five of the minutes....so those have all been approved

GladysAnn clarified and stated that Richard had some questions about whether we should reconfirm it because there was barely a quorum at that meeting and that's why Richard put it on the agenda again for today.

Motion: Shelley motioned, and John seconded, that the Legacy Project Criteria of the January 31, 2006 meeting be approved. Everyone approved and the motion passed.

RECONFIRM MISSION STATEMENT

Jim read the Mission Statement: "Develop, encourage, and coordinate a statewide plan for Arizona's centennial in 2012 including advising the legislature and state agencies on centennial history and heritage, arts and culture, assisting the governor's countdown to the centennial to support school children learning about Arizona's history, and recommending activities and projects that will ensure lasting legacy accomplishments to commemorate the centennial." AHAC must also help develop funding mechanisms for nationwide projects, create committee structures to accomplish the work of coordinating and refining project evaluation processes, determine fund allocations processes, establish project monitoring procedures, launch and sustain a public relations program, provide interested entities with centennial information communication mechanisms, ensure audit and financial controls, initiate and maintain reporting procedure to legislature and donors.

Beth suggested that where it starts with AHAC that should be a different title. It really isn't the mission it could be tactics or implementation or

Betsy said when she took the draft she took the section of the mission statement and turned it into further bullet points under implementation and next step become some of those are real logical for funding, development and subcommittees and others were for marketing and so forth.

(The committee will come back to this issue when all paperwork has been complied)

Individual Commission Contribution

GladysAnn said in the beginning if each of the statutory members would contribute \$1,000 to a pot we would have some working money. At that time John told GladysAnn and Richard that if the 5 statutory members and any other associations could contribute X amount of money, John would be willing contribute a matched amount of money that is in residence at the Arizona Community Foundation. That would give us a pot of \$10,000 which would give us money for taping and transcribing the minutes. It is an easy process to hire and not that expensive but it is instantaneous turn around then we can spend our time putting together better packets. This was a commitment that only the statutory members made. That doesn't mean that KAET, Arts Commission, ASU or the Humanities Council has to come up with the money. However, anyone who could donate even \$50, it would help us. We don't want to make the pot too big because after the bill passes the little bit of money John has raised could be used as match. We don't want to loose much of the capacity to match.

John – We will use just as much as we need. John said knows the procedures now at Arizona Community Foundation, he just has to fill out a form and a check could be available by Friday. Next week he could have the \$5,000 here and then we could get the other \$5,000 from the five agencies.

Jim - State procurement will allow us to donate \$999.00 but not \$1,000 which would put it into a different procurement category.

John – There are undoubtedly other expenses and we don't want to be over come by the fact that we want to hold everything back so it can count as match. Hopefully we will be getting some commitments as we go but depending on when the legislature adjourns, if they don't adjourn until June 1st then we have to wait until the end of August before we start receiving a match.

Jim –Motion that you would encourage the five statutory members to contribute \$999.00 to the Centennial.

Shelley so moved and Noel Stowe 2nd the motion.

Jim asked if there were any further discussions.

GladysAnn clarified that we do have the capacity to completely segregate that money so it cannot be used for anything else and track it and we will give you financial reports.-

John – the money portion does not need to be in the motion but John wanted to know just exactly how to the check should be made out.

GladysAnn replied and said it should be made out to the Arizona State Library - in the subject area put AHAC.

Jim – how do we want to implement this motion....a letter from the Chair to the five statutory members?

Motion: Shelley motioned, and Noel seconded, that the five statutory members to contribute \$999.00 to the Centennial. All members approved and the motion passed.

John just wanted a notation in the minutes about the fact that \$5,000 will be forthcoming from the Arizona Community Foundation, from the general contributions that were earmarked for centennial plans.

By-Laws

The by-laws were drafted directly from Roberts Rules of Order as related to the best information that Catherine May and Jim could put together at the time. It was right after the time the committee structure was voted on at ASU. Jim put in bold put a few notations from Catherine's and Jim's last meeting. As the mission statement states, there is a lot of this that goes back to the statutes, the objectives are 1 thru 6 and out side of the statutory language we have put together the term Arts and Culture in the other documents and he did not know how to incorporate them into the By-Laws.

After further discussion it was decided that the By-Laws would be revised as follows:

Article II: Objectives

Section 2. Recommend measures to the legislature and state agencies to coordinate or improve the effectiveness of activities of state agencies and agencies of the political subdivisions of this state and other persons relating to the interpretation, research, writing and teaching of this state's history, heritage and historic preservation.

Revised:

Section 2. Recommend measures to the legislature and state agencies to coordinate or improve the effectiveness of activities of state agencies and agencies of the political subdivisions of this state and other persons relating to the interpretation, research, writing and teaching of this state's history *including the arts, culture*, heritage and historic preservation.

Section 4. Encourage, in cooperation with appropriate public and private agencies and other persons, training and education in the field of the interpretation, research, writing and teaching of this state's history, heritage and historic preservation.

Revised:

Section 4. Encourage, in cooperation with appropriate public and private agencies and other persons, training and education in the field of the interpretation, research, writing and teaching of this state's history, *including the arts, culture, heritage* and historic preservation.

Article III: Members:

Section 1. The AHAC shall be composed of not less than 10 members, but not more than 20 members, appointed to staggered terms by the State Librarian (ASLAPR Director).

Revised:

Section 1. The AHAC shall be composed of not less than 10 members, but not more than 20 members, appointed to staggered terms by the State Librarian (ASLAPR Director) *and operating of auspices of Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records.*

Section 2. Six of the AHAC members are statutory members:

Director, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records
Executive Director, Arizona Historical Society
Executive Director, Arizona State Museum
Director, Arizona State Parks
Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer
Chair, Historic Sites Review Committee (HSRC)

Revised:

Section 2. *Four* of the AHAC members are statutory members:

Executive Director, Arizona Historical Society
Executive Director, Arizona State Museum
Director, Arizona State Parks
Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer

Added NEW section to Article III: Members:

Section 3. A term shall not exceed three years. A term will end on July 1st. Each member shall serve until a successor has been appointed.

Incorporation of new section in Article III: Members, increased sections to 12 sections.

Article IV: Officers

Section 1. The AHAC will elect four officers:

Chair
Vice-Chair
Secretary

Revised:

Section 1. The AHAC will elect *five* officers:

Chair
Vice-Chair
Vice-Chair for Committees
Secretary
Treasurer

Article V: Meetings

Section 1. The AHAC shall meet in regular quarterly meeting in July, October, January and April. The chair will set specific meeting dates and times.

Revised:

Section 1. The AHAC shall meet *not less than* quarterly in July, October, January and April. The chair will set specific meeting dates and times.

Article VI: Executive Committee

Section 1. The AHAC shall have an executive committee composed of the four elected officers and one member at large designated by the chair.

Revised:

Section 1. The AHAC shall have an executive committee composed of the *five* elected officers and one member at large designated by the chair.

Article VII: Standing Committees

Section 1. There shall be six standing committees of the AHAC:

- Historic Sites Review (HSRC)
- Countdown to the Centennial
- Development
- Marketing
- Programs, Projects, Events
- Membership

Revised:

Section 1. There shall be *not less than* six standing committees of the AHAC:

- Historic Sites Review (HSRC)
- Countdown to the Centennial
- Development
- Marketing
- Programs, Projects, Events
- Membership

Section 7. The Membership Committee will recruit members to serve on the AHAC and the six standing committees. A member of the AHAC shall chair of the Membership Committee.

Revised:

Section 7. The Membership Committee will recruit members to serve on the AHAC and the six standing committees. *Vice Chair for Committees* of the AHAC shall chair of the Membership Committee.

Conflict of interest was discussed (Article XII) and GladysAnn stated that the conflict of interest section of the by-laws was even more important now that we are talking about the Legacy Project since everyone probably has a pet project. She felt that all members should sign a conflict of interest

Motion: To approve amendments to By-Laws was made by Jim and seconded by John. All members approved – motion passed.

RECONFIRM MISSION STATEMENT

Continued...

Jim read the Mission Statement from Betsy's Centennial Plan:

Mission:

“Develop, encourage, and coordinate a statewide plan for Arizona's centennial in 2012 including advising the legislature and state agencies on centennial history and heritage, arts and culture, assisting the governor's countdown to the centennial to support school children learning about Arizona's history, and recommending activities and projects that will ensure lasting legacy accomplishments to commemorate the centennial.”

Noel motion to reaffirm this as the mission statement.

John moved and Noel 2nd the motion.

Shelley clarified it and said that meant it would go on the application.

Motion: To approve Mission Statement was made by Noel and seconded by John. All members approved – motion passed.

Vision Statement

The Vision Statement from Betsy's Centennial Plan:

Our Vision:

A commemoration that encourages all Arizonans to reflect on our unique and authentic history, to experience the rich and diverse tapestry of our heritage, to explore our promising future and that ensures a lasting legacy for future generations.

After discussion the finalized Vision Statement is:

“Commemorations that encourage all Arizonans to reflect on our unique and authentic history, to experience the rich and diverse tapestry of our heritage and to explore our promising future, thus ensuring a lasting legacy.”

Motion: To approve Vision Statement was made by GladysAnn and seconded by Noel. All members approved – motion passed.

Outlining a draft for Statewide Plan – identify stakeholders, who should be keeping an eye on us.

Betsy reviewed her Centennial Plan by briefly reading parts of the Introduction, “Who We Are” and “Taking Stock of the Present” which GladysAnn wrote.

GladysAnn explained that part of the Taking Stock of the Present came from the current statutes, John's list, some of it reflects the work that has already been done from the Legacy Project Criteria and a running list of what might be a contention for Legacy Project. At that point when she wrote it she did not know about Hartman's and Ann's suggestion.

Betsy continued reviewing the "Implementation and the Next Steps" which were Marketing, Development, Programs, Projects, Events, Membership, Countdown to the Centennial.

GladysAnn said that for the mission statement she basically did a laundry list of some of the actions steps from what John did in his original list, which is why the mission statement was so long to begin with.

Betsy asked GladysAnn to explain what "potholders" meant....

GladysAnn explained that Ann used that as an analogy – we were not about saguaro potholders. Those things could happen on their own. However, it is a symbol to GladysAnn about all the stuff we are not going to worry about, i.e., we are not going to worry about all the parades, centennial merchandising sales, arts craft things that everyone will be developing. There are a lot of things that are not under our prevue that will happen because people want to make a buck or they want a parade. We are about the education and the lasting legacy, and the coordination control.

Jim said the first thing he would like to decide is the outline, all the pieces we would like to see in the plan represented in the outline.

Shelley wanted to know who this is for. That determines the sequencing of things and the vocabulary we use. If this is for the Legislature as a document of what our goals and outcomes will be. If this is for the public to encourage their participation then it needs some fine tuning.

Julie also wanted to know who this is for. Julie wrote this for the public.

Jim said he believed that it was for us to meet our statutory obligation, to do a plan.

GladysAnn said we have to do a plan by law; the language is "The historical advisory commission shall develop and coordinate a statewide plan regarding this state's centennial in 2012. The plan shall include the following....." and that's where the three charges came in.

John said it's very specific.

GladysAnn said very specific so she did not think we could do a public plan as our plan. We have to do a plan that is the legal, formal submission to the library board of the centennial plan and from that will be the spin off that will be plan for the public, the plan for local cities and towns – bits and pieces. If Beth could make any corrections to the Fact she that we suggest today, Beth's Fact Sheet is the best possible thing could all take with us any where we went to talk about the centennial. It's very understandable, very accessible; it gives everyone the key information. However it's not the "Plan". The plan is the formal legislative centennial plan by statute.

Jim said this is our understanding of how we are to proceed.

John said that we have a lot of good submissions from around the table and we have a lot of homework to do. We obviously should not try to adopt a plan today.

Jim said that the first thing he wanted to know is, are there enough pieces in the outline that we can legitimately call it a plan.

Shelley said that to her, the beginning couple of pages are documentation, background of what it is that we are doing. Taking Stock of the Present and Next Steps in the committees is where we need to take some time to fine tune and make sure we are all on board with that. The smaller elements are not always totally on track.

Julie agreed with Shelley, there are probably more details that need to be in the outline.

John said his outline had two pages of bullet points which were inputs. John looked at his notes from when he spoke with Shelley. He said that when he and Shelley spoke they listed four points for the plan.

Shelley said they were very close to the committees. She told John that his bullet points were very helpful but they were not organized to be in a structure that would lead us to what we wanted to do – it was a stream of consciousness.

John read Shelley's points of the project; development, marketing, funding and infrastructure categorizing a plan that would be in categories which would certainly motivate the action steps.

Noel said that two things immediately come to mind:

One is that we should read the plan from the point of view that as we go forward members of the legislature will turn to the plan for what we are doing. We really need to think about have we covered everything we need to by statute but as we think ahead that as people go back and look at the plan that they are going to see things in it things that we anticipate doing. It needs to be written very carefully. The beginning part that was just talked about that meets the requirements of the statutes needs to also include what we anticipate what we will be doing so that as we advance things and propose things we don't shoot ourselves in the foot. We need to anticipate members of the legislature will need this and be interested in what we are doing and we give them some direction on thinking in the same way.

Secondly, we need to think about whom else is going to be reading this; people who want to propose things to the commission. There will be two specific audiences that will be reading this; Members of the Legislature saying what are you doing, where are you going, how can we help? Then there will be members of the public who will want to bring proposals to us and they will read this very carefully. Noel agreed with Shelley in that we need to identify very specific targets – if he were one of those audiences and reading this would he find what he needs in it?

Beth said that it never works to have one document work for all the different things. If it's for the Legislature we should focus wholly on that.

John agreed with Beth, we should have the official document which answers the Legislative mandate. We are approaching the one year since we had our first meeting. John said he's been thinking about a brief statement he could make to the appropriation committee a week from today. He does not think they will ask where we are on the statewide plan that they required at the senate bill last year. They could and if they did we tell them we are very close to finalizing the initial mandate of last year's legislation. We are waiting because of the whole issue of how we approach funding is so dependent or will be measured by this legislation so obviously we can't have a plan until we know the disposition of this legislation. It will have a very strong barring on the plan they have asked us to do. It tells them we are working on what they told us to do last year but one of the most important pieces is inherent to the current bill.

GladysAnn respectfully disagreed with John. We do our annual report in such a way where we can take pieces out of it to do what ever we have to do later. It is one place where she knows everything about the agency is. It's done for the library board, it meets our statutory mandate. It's done in such a way where we can spin a piece off to explain health information to St. Joseph's Hospital for example.

Beth said agreed, she had no problem with having a singular document which includes everything that we ever thought was important to what we are doing. If there is a document we need to submit to or reviewed by the Legislature we just take those parts out. If this is the definitive master document in which we take something out for the Legislature, she has no problem with that.

GladysAnn said it would be one place where we can answer any question.

Jim said a lot of time communicating with people who want to sponsor a legacy project or event would be flushed out by the committee.

Shelley said the stimulus to her question at the beginning was the 2nd paragraph – she was focusing on what is the value to the public in us celebrating/commemorating the centennial. We need to flush that out so it's not for the Legislature to find out what people believe but what difference it going to make in peoples lives. We need to rephrase that part.

John asked, rephrase what.

Shelley said the second paragraph about what are the benefits to be gained. To the Legislature we say they are going to learn things. To the pubic its different issues that we write.

Noel said he does not want to loose what's here because he would like to say you are going to learn something that is important to State Agencies. He would like to broaden and add to it.

Shelley said for the Legislature this might be ok, but not when we decide how communicate this to the public. Even the value of the citizens is of interest to the Legislature because it's not for them personally but it's for what impact it makes on the community.

Jim suggested that the introduction of Who We Are should just be the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission. He assigned the following committee members to edit certain sections of the Centennial Plan:

Action: Shelley to edit the Who We Are

Action: GladysAnn & Betsy to edit Taking Stock of the Present

Action: Noel to edit Implementation and the Next Steps.

Action: Richard (not present at meeting) to edit Imagining the Centennial

All committee members were encouraged to communicate with the members working on the above their thoughts before the next meeting.

All committee members present decided the Theme “One land, many voices” was not needed.

Discussion of Potential Legacy Projects

Shelley felt that it is premature for us to determine what it is that we are supporting. She wanted to know if we are going to have a Program and Events committee to come up with the criteria, application and a process for deciding whose role it is to look at the applications. She said that it is up to us to define the process.

John said the legislation is very clear, Recommend a project that seems to imply that it would be a sanctioned project and we put our seal of recommendation on it. Projects that would get funding and community support.

Julie thought there should be a sub-committee of this commission that is the first stop for things before we consider it.

Jim said that we have created a “Program, Projects and Events Committee to develop the criteria for the Centennial programs, projects and events and will be available to assist in implementation of said activities.” He said in reality the Programs, Projects and Events Committee may be the clearing house to bring forth projects that appear to meet the criteria we adopted.

GladysAnn said that we have two things in place as a result our discussions. One being the by-law section Jim just quoted and the other which is John’s language to “Create structures to accomplish the work of coordinating and defining project evaluation processes.”

Shelley said she can support the Legacy Projects in concept but we need to be sure we are not just supporting the things we know about before there is an announcement to the general public so they feel engaged. She does not want people to criticize us because they did not get the opportunity to participate.

Noel said that two good examples of the types of projects we want to encourage come to us are the Centennial Plaza in Tucson and the Arizona Memory Project. Those are the types of things to be discussed in terms of planning, public comment and discussions.

John thought that we might want to put the draft plan out for public comments.

Jim wanted John to bring that statement up at the next meeting.

Noel said we have two concrete examples of the types of projects we want to encourage to come to the commission for its approval as Legacy Projects. They represent good planning, process, engagement of different audience and good budgeting procedures that illustrate what we like to see in terms of our application.

Motion to approve the two projects (Centennial Plaza in Tucson and the Arizona Memory Project) as the kind of Project that we want to bring forward as Legacy Projects was made by Noel and seconded by Shelley.

GladysAnn summarized the motion to clarify for Betsy and Catherine. We have two projects that come to the commission that represent the kind of Legacy projects we hope to work with toward the centennial.

Catherine said she was a little confused about the wording of the motion because it doesn't seem to say the same thing that we did for the downtown Phoenix Partnership Proposal.

GladysAnn said it doesn't.

Catherine said we tentatively approved and endorse the project, according to the minutes, subject to review after we complete our criteria.

Noel said just the concept.

Catherine said that if we did it that way then if these appear what we would approve down the road then why can't we do the same thing? She wanted to know why we would do something different.

GladysAnn said she felt we were forced into something we were not ready to do last time.

Jim said we did adopt criteria earlier in this meeting

Catherine said what she is hearing is we feel uncomfortable with the actions we took last month, so we are going to slow things down and come at it in a cleaner fashion.

Jim said right but we want some positive feedback on these projects so they could be utilized as examples.

Catherine said that because of lack of clarity she would back out of voting.

GladysAnn asked her not to do that because several people were not able to vote because they are projects either David or GladysAnn are connected with so they cannot vote. We will check the tape of the minutes and see what happened.

Action: Juanita will listen to the tape of last months minutes (2/28/06) to help determine the exact wording that was used in the motion endorsing the Capitol Mall Revitalization Plan.

Exact wording of motion from the minutes of the 2/28/08 meeting: *Motion to endorse the concept, the scope and the spirit of the Capitol Mall Revitalization Plan*

Betsy said she had the same concern – she is also confused. She thought we approved in concept something's or endorsed them in concept.

GladysAnn said it was. Somehow in the corrections of the minutes it got stronger wording because we did them in a group environment trying to help the capitol mall statement they needed through the open meeting law they required a statement immediately after the meeting. In that process it came out a little stronger than we actually said.

Jim asked Noel and Shelley if the words “approved in concept” could be used in the motion.

Noel said it was fine with him.

Betsy said on page four of the minutes of the last meeting said “They would like to have the project tentatively approved and endorsed subject to final review after we have completed our final criteria”

Julie said that there is a motion on page five “The Commission endorses revitalization of Arizona’s Capitol Mall as part of the Centennial Celebration.”

Jim said that endorses the concept

John said there was a lot of discussion about this is a very broad concept, it’s a student project at this point and we all know there is a long way to go between a student demonstration project and a project. John said he does not feel anyone is going to press us on the fact we put a huge stamp of approval on a student council.

Noel disagreed with John. He has already had them on the phone with him saying “you missed the meeting and we will come back and visit you”. That suggests to Noel that he needs to be educated and that means that two people will come lobby him in his office.

Noel said he would like to have a strong endorsement of the concept and the idea.

Jim stated that we endorse in concept these two projects as potential model Legacy Projects.

Shelley seconded the motion.

Motion: To approve to endorse in concept these two projects as potential model Legacy Projects was made by Noel and seconded by Shelley. Motion passed – David and GladysAnn abstained from voting.

Names for Committees

Jim asked if we needed to populate and start up the projects committee.

GladysAnn said that each one of them took a Shepard's role for the certain activities.

John asked why we would assign that to a subcommittee.

Jim said just to review the applications to make sure all the parts are there.

Shelley said that they bring them all to the commission if they meet the criteria.

Noel said that they would do the initial review so we are not sitting here arguing about criteria #4 whether it's been met or not.

Jim said that the project committees needs to get off and running in terms of process.

Julie said that it was her understanding that John and her were given the task of overseeing the program and events committee which is why she got involved in the application and criteria. She is happy to continue working, now that the form has been amended. Now part of the process is letting people know, announcing so everybody knows we are now accepting applications.

Noel asked if these two projects are models of what we would like to see.

GladysAnn said that the centennial plaza did not use the form. When we used the form for the Memory Project it did highlight all the things we asked people to do. The form is not on the website because it was not done then. She thinks the next item on the agenda should be we come up with a list of associations, groups and entity that we would send the criteria and the outline of the plan to and application to and say this is where we are.

Shelley said that once you go beyond this core group of people who were imagining legacy projects, those constituents are going to say, where's the dough?

Beth said we have to make it clear we are in the recommending business not the funding.

Jim suggested we just keep in within the committee to where we have a draft plan and then staff the committees personally.

Last three items of the agenda will be carried over to the next meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

- **Outline a draft for Statewide Plan – identify stakeholders, who should be keeping an eye on us.**
- **Discuss Potential Legacy Projects**
- **Outreach – Staffing Committees, Candidates & Categories**

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No member of the public had any comments.

NEXT MEETING DATE

April 25, 2006 from 1:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. in the Director's Office Conference Room of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, 1700 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007

ADJOURNMENT

Acting Chairman Jim adjourned the meeting at 3:32 pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Juanita Cason
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records

MEETING HANDOUTS

Agenda for the March 28, 2006 Meeting
Draft Minutes of the February 28, 2006 meeting
Centennial Plan from Hartman & Woosley for Centennial Projects
Requests for the AZ Memory Project
Draft application from Julie Yoder
Letter from Ruth McGregor
Draft Letterhead
Fact Sheet for HB2371
Draft Plan from GladysAnn